

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/605,515	10/05/2003	De-Jen Lu	AĊIP0017USA	2514		
27765 NORTH AME	27765 7590 02/07/2008 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 506			BROWN, MICHAEL J			
MERRIFIELD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2116			
		•				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
•			02/07/2008	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

Advisory Action						
Before	the Filing of an Appeal Brief					

Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>[</i>
10/605,515	LU, DE-JEN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michael J. Brown	2116	

	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Michael J. Brown	2116				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
ТНЕ	REPLY FILED 08 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.				
1. [The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
b) Externave	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Intensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee the been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee index 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as						
set fo may	orth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing da					
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
	<u>NDMENTS</u> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	ecause			
<u>_</u>	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co						
	 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 						
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		P . A d d	(DTOL 204)			
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. <u> </u>	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,					
7. 🔀	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will will will will will will will wi	ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
	Claim(s) allowed: 4-6, and 12-14 Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,7-11,15 and 16.						
ΔFF	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and			
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(′	Is to provide a 1).			
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio QUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
	∑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
	☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments submitted 1/8/2008 are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Norris and Kelkar do not assign performance states for restricted URL's. Examiner disagrees as Norris introduces the assignment of performance states. The unrestricted URL's are not important as Kelkar was introduced only to teach a wireless communication device(web-browsing device) that is being used to access web pages(URLs). Applicant also argues that Brown does not teach that the extensive testing includes tracking the CPU workload during the processing of the web page. Examiner disagrees as Brown teaches determining the optimum voltage setting for a previous version of a similar processor 110(see column 6, lines 42-45). From there it is determined whether the voltage selection table contains an unassigned entry. Combined with Norris and Kelkar, Brown appropriately teaches tracking the CPU workload during the processing of the web page.

NITIN C. PITCL 2/4/08 PRIMARY EXAMINED 2100. TECHNOLORY CENTER 2100.